REMARKS

Claims 5, 6, 8-14, 16, 21-36, and 42-44 have been canceled. Claims 1, 15, and 37 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-4, 7, 15, 17-20, and 37-41 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 15, 17-20, and 37-41 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattis in view of Cloutier.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claims 1, 15, and 37, both Mattis and Cloutier are concerned with *delivery* of content to recipients, not complying with requirements that non-duplicative email messages be retained for "a prescribed retention period," as recited in claims 1, 15, and 37. The objects cached as taught by Mattis are not retained for a prescribed retention period, and instead objects are deleted from the cache to make room without regard to whether a prescribed retention period has expired. Mattis, col. 2, lines 53-59 and col. 21, lines 18-26 ff. Cloutier likewise focuses on delivery of messages and does not appear to teach retaining a message for a prescribed period of time. Also, Mattis describes computing a "name key" based on an object's name and an "object key" based on the object's entire content. An object is identified as a duplicate, and not stored more than once, if its content data is the same. By contrast, as recited in claims 1, 15, and 37, message tags are computed based on a "subset" of the properties of a message, including a "message sender" and a "message submission time." As noted in the present specification, those properties generally are sufficient to determine whether a message found in mailbox A is a duplicate of one found in mailbox B, e.g., a message sent to multiple recipients including A and B. Using the approach recited in the claims, uniqueness is determined with a minimal amount of computation. Cloutier describes a key based on the "Date" and "From" header values, col. 6, lines 7-11, but Cloutier uses the resulting "code signature" to alert a user that a new message has been received, to facilitate efficient remote retrieval, not to determine whether a message is a duplicate of one that has already been placed in an archive for retention for a prescribed retention period, as recited in the claims. In addition, the claims recite processing and, if required, storing a "copy" of the message that has been retrieved from a mailbox, whereas Cloutier appears to describe performing computations on a message as stored on the email server itself, and does not describe storing in an archive copies of non-duplicate messages. In summary, Mattis and Cloutier do not, either

singly or in combination, teach non-duplicative indexing, archiving, and retention of copies of messages retrieved from multiple mailboxes, as recited in the claims. As such, claims 1, 15, and 37 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 7, which depend from claim 1; claims 17-20, which depend from claim 15; and claims 38-41, which depend from claim 37 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: ___2-19-08___   _____

William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V   408-973-2592
F   408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014